

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 have been examined. By this Amendment, Applicant is adding three new dependent claims. Claims 1-13 are pending in the Application.

1. Formalities:

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority and for confirming that the certified copy of the priority document has been received.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for initialing the reference on form PTO-1449 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 21, 2000.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for approving the drawings submitted on June 21, 2000.

2. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shintani et al. (US 5,875,034) ["Shintani"]. For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 recites that an electronic still camera comprises "a power source section comprising a first power source for supplying the camera section and a second power source for supplying the printer section separately from each other." The Examiner alleges that Shintani discloses this feature. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that voltages E2 and E3 disclose the first power source and voltage E1 discloses the second power source.

Applicant submits that the Examiner is mischaracterizing the claimed combination and/or reference. Figure 2A of Shintani clearly shows that the camera sections and printer section are driven off of the same power source, main battery EB (see also col. 9, lines 7-62). Because different electronic components require different voltages, the power supply unit 109 of Shintani

comprises a DC/DC converter to produce voltages E1, E2 and E3 (Fig. 2A). Applicant submits that E1, E2, and E3 are generally known to one skilled in the art as distribution busses, not power sources. Further, one skilled in the art would identify the main battery EB as the power source to the camera sections and the printer section, not busses E1, E2, and E3.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Shintani does not disclose or even remotely suggest all the elements of claim 1.

Because claims 7 and 8 depend on claim 1, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. They further distinguish from Shintani by virtue of the "switching device" recited therein.

Claim 7 recites that the still camera comprises "a switching device for connecting the second power source to the camera section, and for connecting the first power source to the printer section." The Examiner alleges that Table 1 of Shintani discloses this feature. Applicant submits that, at most, Shintani may disclose that certain sections of the camera are either turned "on" or "off" based on the control signal Dcon. Applicant submits that Shintani does not disclose or remotely suggest that the "first" and "second" power sources that feed "the camera section" and "the printer section", respectively, may be switched to the other section as required by the claimed combination.

Because claim 8 recites a similar switching device, Applicant submits that claim 8 is patentable for at the reasons given above.

3. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintani in view of Aoto et al. (US 6,515,761) ["Aoto"]. For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses.

Because claims 2-6 and 10 depend on claim 1 and Aoto does not make up for the deficiencies of the primary reference, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. The claims are further distinguishable from Shintani in view of Aoto by virtue of the features set forth therein.

For example, claim 2 recites that "the recording material is a photographic material." The Examiner concedes that Shintani does not disclose this feature but applies Aoto to allegedly cure this deficiency. Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not apply the teachings of Aoto to Shintani with respect to claim 2 because it would undermine a primary object of Shintani.

A primary object of Shintani is to overcome the drawbacks of the prior art. One such drawback is the inability of the prior art to print on an external recording sheet (col. 2, lines 1-3). Also, an external recording sheet is required to implement at least one embodiment disclosed in Shintani, the ability to print by means of hand scanning (col. 18, lines 42-57). By its very nature, photosensitive recording sheet would require an enclosure that is impervious to light. Because an enclosed recording sheet would undermine these objectives of Shintani, Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the teaching of Shintani and Aoto as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 3 recites that the printing head moves "relative to the photographic material." The Examiner concedes that neither Shintani or Aoto discloses this feature but then takes official notice to cure this deficiency.

Applicant submits that it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the printing head of either Shintani or Aoto to move the print head relative to the paper. Both Shantani and Aoto disclose print heads that print at least one line at a time (see col. 13, line 65 to col. 14, line 2 of Shintani and col. 17, lines 18-28 of Aoto). Applicant submits that moving the print head on these inventions would needlessly add additional components such as a print head drive motor and gearing. Further, the Examiner's reasoning for modification is not sound since the paper still needs to be transported into and out of the camera, and therefore, there will be no reduction in transport rollers. In fact, Applicants submit that the size and complexity of the cameras in the references would increase if modified as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 6 recites that "the second power source is constituted of batteries of a type that is compatible with a battery for the first power source." The Examiner concedes that Shintani and Aoto do not disclose this feature but attempts to cure this deficiency by taking Official Notice. For at least the following reason, Applicant traverses.

Applicant submits that "[i]t would not be appropriate for the examiner to take official notice of ...technical facts in areas of esoteric technology...." MPEP 2144.03. Applicant submits that the sizing of a power supply for the various components comprising a camera is an area of esoteric technology. Technical factors such as the voltage and current ratings for each component and whether or not to add additional components such as voltage converters must be analyzed. In addition, other factors such as the size and economics of the camera must also be

considered when adding components such as batteries and voltage converters. Therefore, Applicant submits that the claimed combination is not obvious and the Examiner must find support in a prior art reference.

4. Allowable Subject Matter:

Applicant thanks the Examiner for finding allowable subject matter in claim 9. Applicant has rewritten claim 9 in independent form and requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Please note that paragraph 3 of the Office Action appears to have a typographical error because it lists claim 10 rather than claim 9 as having the allowable subject matter.

5. New Claims:

By this Amendment, Applicant has added three new dependent claims. Applicant submits that the new claims are patentable by virtue of the limitation set forth therein.

6. Conclusion:

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
APPLICATION NO.: 09/598,333

Attorney Docket No.: Q59726

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Bhaskar Kakarla
Registration No. 54,627

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 19, 2004